



FRANÇOIS LARUELLE 2017-09-05

## THE CONCEPT OF A 'FIRST TECHNOLOGY'

LEXICON,  
MASHINES

MARXISM, NON GENERIC SCIENCE, NON-LARUELLE, NON-PHILOSOPHY, SIMONDON,  
TECHNOLOGY

Laruelle, François. "Le concept d'une 'technologie première'" in *Gilbert Simondon: une pensée de l'individuation et la technique*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1994. 206-219.

The Concept of a "First Technology"

François Laruelle

### A "Unified Theory" of Technics and Technology

In order to define the object of which we speak and to set its limits in our discourse, also in order to define a certain relation to the work of Simondon or Heidegger—the two greatest philosophers of technics—we will make two distinctions whose relevance or non-relevance will be demonstrated by their capacity or incapacity to "found" a new discipline called "first technology." This distinction is expressed thus: a *science* rather than a philosophy or a "human science" of technics, but a science of the *essence* of technics, not of technical properties or facts. Thus our object in the constitution of Simondon and Heidegger's works will participate according to a relation to be determined whose formulation testifies to a paradoxical nature: a true science, not a philosophy; but a transcendental science of a new genre of essence, not a science of facts, whether "ontic" or "positive." Essence is the traditional object of philosophy and that through which it claims to be distinguished from science: how could the latter, while still remaining science, take an essence for its object?

We think that the means of resolving the most general antinomy, that of science and philosophy, exists beyond philosophy either as epistemology, or as positivism (=science of philosophy) and that it must be sought beyond the invariant means of ontology, but not outside a dimension of thought and experience which philosophy itself has always postulated without ever recognizing it as such and completely denying its role in science. *It is no longer a question of Being, but of the One insofar as it refuses any convertibility with Being and thus must be called "One-of-the-last-instance" so as to render it inalienable in Being.* We will return to this point. What signification can it then have for this antinomy, partially derived from the precedent of *technics* and *technology*? Can the principles of a unified and not *unitary* (=philosophical, thus hierarchical) theory be established from the

technical and the technological? This new discipline, "founded" in the non-philosophical experience of the One, would require a double support. It would require the support of technology, i.e. of a philosophical type of knowledge of technics, of the logos as techno-logos, consequently the dimension of *essence*. And it would also require the support of science insofar as the latter is the gauge of an objective, rigorous, analytic and non-interpretative treatment of technical objects and properties and which we will in fact call "technics," but only under the reserve of this treatment, thus distinguishing this usage of the word "technics" from its philosophical or technological usage. We can thus define the object of this unified theory—if it is possible: for knowledge, it will have to set off again from the One—no longer as the banal and philosophical *essence of technics*, which supposes given or supposedly given objects as technical, as well as their intentional telos under the philosophical horizon of essence as *eidōs*; but as the *Essence (of) technics*, a writing designed to indicate an indivisible block, a strict and no longer philosophical or hierarchical identity of technics and essence. This "strict" identity obviously remains to be thought and to be known both with the help of the One and technological discourses; but we can always posit it as our *object*.

A "unified theory," without being an "ontic science," is not however an "ontological science" in the sense that philosophy or metaphysics is. It represents the emergence of a new theoretical genre, *neither philosophy or science but using them both along with essence and the scientific object*, in relations which have become unintelligible to the most reflexive epistemology as well as the most positivist. The fact that it is one, without being a science in the classical or ordinary sense, is explained by the nature of its cause, the One: a unified theory under this form represents a *transcendental usage* of the sciences. This is a non-philosophical usage, because here the transcendental is no longer convertible with the metaphysical and *does not claim to add or subtract anything from the sciences or to intervene in their practice*. This is an *immanent usage of the sciences and consequently leaves them in their current state*; a new discipline which includes in it the concept of science but without philosophically dominating it or claiming to legislate over it anymore.

We depart from a currently accepted thesis so as to pose our problem which is, in fact, that of the usage of this thesis, not of its validity:

- 1) The knowledges of the "technician" belong to a wider sphere, that of projective knowledges, of directional or intentional contents: they extend from certain biological phenomena to the phenomena of the "understanding," the "project" and, in general, technology, thus to the knowledges which compose the "technological."
- 2) This type of knowledge does not give rise to the sciences in the strong or classical sense of the term, explicative sciences rather than projective, determining rather than reflecting, mathematized in the end. We do not seek to problematize this thesis but to pose the following problem: is it possible to elaborate an egalitarian *unified theory* of these two types of knowledge? This theory can therefore neither be a science, analytic and reductive of projective knowledges, nor inversely a philosophical synthesis which would again resume projecting this thesis and philosophically dominating the sciences. We must seek, beyond this double reductionism, for a principle of unification which is neither scientific nor philosophical—a third instance of the experience of thought—or at least to orient ourselves towards it and its necessity.

Consequently, we will propose a certain usage of the Theory of demonstration and particularly the works of Gödel for a new *paradigm* of thought which we will extract from metamathematical problems so as to generalize and transpose it into the more "conceptual" problems of philosophy and technics. Rather than a philosophy or an epistemology of knowledges or sciences of technics, which remains a philosophical endeavor and, consequently, a simple speculative commentary on these knowledges, we will re-inscribe technics and technology in the theoretical interval between science and metascience, between the language-object and metalanguage. The Gödelian idea—even beyond Gödel's own works—consists, on the one hand, in postulating an interiority or a practical immanence of science, which is legitimated of itself without needing to rely on the philosophical; and, on the other hand, in judging the formative pretensions of metalanguage so as to refute them under their most philosophical or "auto-foundational" forms.

How is this problematic applied here?

1. We suppose that the ordinary knowledges which have technics for their object, being of the projective type, are globally linked to a *meta-language* which describes technics in its own way. These knowledges of technics—"technology" in our sense—do not spontaneously arise from *science* ["la" science], nor from technics such as science would apprehend it, but a metalanguage which decides upon the being of technics.
2. What takes on the role of language-object in relation to this metalanguage which technology is? Not the sciences which are invested in technics (scientific reductionism) but the *identity*, to be determined, of technics grasped by science and technology, an identity of the technician and the technologist: the "Essence (of) technics/technical Essence."
3. It is possible, through a regulated process and operations to be determined, to project or internalize the metalanguage which is technology in the theoretical space defined by this strict identity of (explicative) sciences and (projective) knowledges, of technics-under-science and technics-under-philosophy.
4. If this *identity* or this *equality* excludes, as we have said, the double reduction (scientific, technological and/or philosophical), it is still for the moment unthought as such. In reality, we can only posit a simple *hypothesis* to be progressively determined with the *data* furnished by the forms of technological thought.

5. That which is nothing but a hypothesis makes it possible to explain the illusions which engender this double reductionism: illusions of the philosophies-of-technics on the one hand and illusions which produce technological knowledges left to themselves on the other. In both cases, they are of the philosophical or quasi-philosophical type; technology also, and not only science, secretes its "spontaneous philosophy."

This identity is not a new figure taken from "occidental metaphysics;" it is neither deduced by the philosopher, the technician or the scientist. This is a new type of theoretical hypothesis which is not inferred from existing knowledges, but represents the chance or advent of a new *usage* of that which has no use, pure theory; or a new *theory* of that which has no theory, technics. A *scientific utopia*, perhaps...

A unified theory here is not the simple positivist symmetry of a philosophy. No doubt it is a question of refusing the authority of the "philosophy of technics," as well as the more or less vicious circle of what a technics of technics would be rather than a "human science" of technics or the technical, with the philosophical and/or technological autoposition which composes the core of these doctrines. However, this refusal does not treat itself to a theoreticism or a complementary scientific idealism and still less to a positivism (a science of technics). Outside of the philosophy of technics and its modes (history, etc.), one could imagine a "hard" science of technics. But a unified theory, if it is instead in fact a science, cannot be a reductive, "physicalist" science of technics. Its object is the *Essence (of) technics*, and the latter does not claim to be substituted for objects, machines and operations, still less for their physical, economic conditions, etc. Instead, science is here the only rigorous knowledge of the *Essence (of) technics*. It is the supreme guardian of the immanence of the technical situation, the guarantor of a purely phenomenal description, an immanence which is in addition then no longer that of knowledge in general, but which will have to receive a form adapted to technics. This is not a theoreticist reduction, and only philosophy can believe—for a second—in technical phenomena "in themselves," having no other "in itself" but *Essence*, which is not itself technological.

### The Essence (of) Technics and Techno-logy

So as to engage more specifically with our objects, let us impart some suggested distinctions and draw out several consequences.

1. The first distinction is that between the *technical* and the *technological*. These will no longer be two types of entities or objects, "phenomena" supposed as two "technics" or being *in themselves* of the order of "technics" and distinguished simply by certain material, economic, social or historical traits and by their different relations to science. Technics instead is here the object which is offered to science (thus including contemporary "technologies"), whereas technology is of the order of discourse and knowledge, knowledge of the human sciences concerning this object and more generally knowledge of the philosophical type, *techno-logos* or *techno-logical difference*, which is still immersed in, even if it is removed from, the human sciences. Our principal object is thus technics rather than techno-logy taken in the sense above.

2. This distinction is continued and specified by another which now bears upon the content of the single word "technics." The latter here designates instead the essence of technics, but more exactly what we call the technical *Essence* of technics: *in the entire first approximation* (to be rectified), the ensemble of actions, operations and causalities which compose the technical *phenomenon* is grasped in its ingredients and its ultimate requisites. It could also more traditionally designate *the supposedly or so-called "technical" effects and objects*. But here still we make a choice, at least apparently: our real object, what we propose to know or determine ourselves, is the *Essence (of) technics* and not technical objects.

We will ask: what is it that is really "technical" and its place, this so-called "essence" or better yet these "technical" objects so fastidiously described by Simondon who knew that of which he spoke? This question has no relevance from our point of view and is decomposed in the following way:

1. If there are technical objects, these are what Simondon describes, but we then doubt here that, even as "becoming" or "concretization," they exist with a scientific objectivity and that they define the *Essence (of) technics*. On the other hand, what we call the technical *Essence* of technics is not itself "technical," i.e. is not a technical object and cannot be understood beginning from Simondon's philosophy, through a reading or a re-interpretation of his philosophy. Since, however, the notion of *object* is here a philosophical notion *par excellence*, bound to objectification, the logos and every Greco-Simondonian ontology—if we are allowed this summation—we will say rigorously so as to rectify Heidegger's formula: *the technical Essence of technics is not at all techno-logical and can only be understood by the notion of "technical object," whether in a state of genesis or not, i.e. by techno-logy* in the highest defined sense of the techno-logos, we will say of the onto-techno-logos, which is that of Simondon.

However, it is not sufficient to say that the essence of technics is not techno-logical if this is to leave it suspended and undetermined. Heidegger still postulates the validity of ontology and technology too much to do something besides its deconstruction and to not leave the *Essence (of) technics* undetermined thus tested in a still too negative way. It must be further determined and in a more positive but not positivist way. Then how do we proceed, since in all evidence we cannot ignore Simondon or Heidegger and his phenomenology of instrumentality, whose authority and relevance we have come, however, to suspend? To remove any contradiction, it suffices to return to these topological philosophies under the condition of this suspension and, consequently, to treat them, and with them the whole sphere called "techno-logy," as a simple material and no longer as a perspective; as an ensemble of properties or phenomena without relevance for determining *by themselves, by their*

*auto-interpretation or their autoposition*, the Essence (of) technics, but as the aid from which, however, a new theory could determine it.

In other words: on the one hand, Heidegger and Simondon's descriptions both belong to the genre of onto-techno-logical difference (either, with Simondon, to set it in play as process of concretization and functional overdetermination; or, with Heidegger, to extract it, if you will, behind itself and to articulate it via ontological difference, indeed via the "withdrawal" which makes it possible to think the latter, a withdrawal which, however, continues to insist upon its relevance). From our point of view, these descriptions bear upon the mixtures of technical effects and philosophical decisions. The famous "technical objects" of the former and the equally celebrated "instrumental circuit" of the latter do not exist "in themselves" but are simply and supposedly related to technics elevated to the state of essence: these are amphibiological formations but inevitable if one is a philosopher, i.e. the more or less Greek and phenomenological decisions that isolate phenomena which are the material, physical and social phenomena produced by technical causality and which elevate them, not however without good reason, to the state of fact or technical factum, indeed sometimes to the essence of technics. But for us they remain *techno-logical universals*.

On the other hand, if these universals can no longer, for us, define or of themselves think the essence of technics, they remain completely "well founded" in their order which is that of an objective fetishism and are necessary as objective data for a discipline which would be proposed, now not by a philosophical but scientific usage—moreover in a "unified-theoretical" sense to be determined—of these universals, of defining this essence in a positive and non-circular way. It is a question of theoretically rendering *technics* intelligible without deducing or projecting it from so-called "technical" phenomena in an intuitive and ambiguous way; without making of this essence the result of autoposition, more or less worked or altered into superficial technical effects.

On this condition essence will cease being an undetermined generality. Under the technical Essence of technics, we will, in fact, no longer search for a trait common to the spoke, the motor and the computer; common either by abstraction, or even by autoposition of properties supposedly already common; a trait which would encompass technical objects. Initially we are not given the latter by arbitrarily supposing that they are "technical." No, this essence is itself a new type of object without originary or speculative continuity with "technical objects." This essence of technics is still before us; we do not have to philosophize it as having already taken place, but instead we have to know it, to produce knowledges oriented around it. For that, under certain suspended conditions, we will help ourselves to these descriptions of the spoke, the motor or the computer, descriptions to which our relation can be expressed thus: no longer to interpret Simondon again, to stop reinterpreting the essence of technics; but to use Simondon and techno-logical interpretations so as to know the Essence (of) technics and, towards this end, to transform or rectify these interpretations; finally, to explain them in the techno-logical appearance under which they give this essence.

If we now take off again from the techno-logical given in its spontaneous autopresentation and its sufficiency, which interpretations are necessary in order to come to the preceding distinctions? Philosophy and the human sciences create a system so as to constitute the sphere of techno-logical discourse. It is on this behalf that "technological objects" exist, i.e. an amphibology of the Essence (of) technics and the object as onto-techno-logical form. It is not sufficient to say, with the hopes of destroying technics as an "other-world:" there are no technical phenomena but a technical interpretation of phenomena, because this would be to reconstitute a generalized technology as the general form of every "other-world," simultaneously the philosophical machine and engineering philosophy [philosophie machinante]. This is to reconstitute the philosophical myth of a supposedly "technical" object whose nature is never known; a confusion of a so-called gratuitously "technical" phenomenon with an essence which is completely philosophical.

Two reductions or two suspensions are at least necessary so as to access the Essence (of) technics and to extract it from its intuition and its consummation, from its philosophical contemplation. First, an ontological reduction of transcendent technical appearances or suppositions subordinated to techno-logical difference. This is the setting in parentheses of regional or ontic appearances of technics through which the human sciences nourish themselves; the suspension of the perspectives of the engineer, the manufacturer, the sociologist, the anthropologist, the economist, the psychologist, the "technologist," etc., subordinated to the perspective of philosophy as "techno-logy," and its correlate: *the onto-techno-logical relation or difference* to which the descriptions of Heidegger and Simondon are consecrated which therefore extracts an invariant techno-logical schema that synthesizes every perspective in a superior perspective. Technological efficacy—onto-techno-logical difference—is, in fact, irreducible to one of the four causes isolated by metaphysics: it contains the four, but as their "superior form." It generalizes their division or their heterogeneity as well as their unity; it renders these two properties coextensive at the same time as it suspends or annuls their most massive or regional forms, the most representative, the most susceptible of being opposed in a transcendent way.

But a second nullification from our perspective is necessary, that of philosophy itself, of the techno-logical causality still external to the Essence (of) technics. But this suspension of techno-logical philosophy, merely a new discipline—a unified theory of science and philosophy—can activate it, thus extracting an Essence (of) technics obviously according to non-philosophical processes and returning to the immanence of the "technical situation" without simply reflecting the technological schema and its effects in it as generalities.

We will stop imagining technical causality via the physical model of inertia; or via the technico-philosophical model of a production; or via the restrained models of the spoke, motor and computer which are transcendent ensembles beginning from which we can simply make *opinions* on this generality which would be "the-technics" or "the-technologies," but not anymore. Any supposedly technical object can only serve as an example of the Essence (of) technics. The latter is not made, but known or made to be known in a science to be practiced here and now. This is why we will describe this essence by the "formal" terms of "technesis" and "technema," for example, rather than by projections issuing from a specific tool of mechanics or informatics which are here only materials and models of interpretation for the science of this essence. This is to challenge the "history of technics" as well as their "philosophies," at least as an ultimate perspective, along with the circular and unstable generalities which they produce. The theory of the Essence (of) technics is an inaugural rupture with the technician's construction of machines along with their economic management and their philosophical "meditation." It is not prolonged in a techno-logical essence of constructed and supposedly given machines. It stops the chain of confusion which proceeds from the given and inert machine-objects to their operation or their techno-logical scheme and from the latter to their essence. But if it stops being inscribed in the production of techno-logical universals, this is in order to take the latter as regional properties which it must explain.

The goal of these reductions is therefore to dissolve the amphibology due to which philosophies and the human sciences thrive; the confusion of the Essence (of) technics with its regional, material or economic conditions, etc., with its philosophical conditions; the idea that there would have been an originary continuity between supposedly technical experience and this essence. However, this dissolution is only one of the aspects, the least positive, of the endeavor which concerns determining the immanent phenomenon of technics, determining it more positively than Heidegger did, but without reflecting the "technical object" in this essence as, for example, Simondon has done.

Our manner of action must be understood in its ambition but also in its limits. We cease treating technical "objects" or "causality" as metaphysical entities—"mythological," as a philosopher would say—which would willingly align ourselves with an unspecified decision or line of demarcation, manipulating scientific knowledge and reified, factualized and fetishized technical effects, and would lead us to believe that we could somewhat describe the real, somewhat modify it in its essence. The invariant of the "philosophies of technics" is that it more or less circularly arranges effects or processes, certain properties which are supposed to define this order of phenomena, and philosophical decisions, this mélange which is supposed to be equivalent with essence. But this discourse rests on a forgetting or a repression of something—x which a science would precisely propose rather than taking it for its object: the *essence* or the *identity* (of) technics, *the identity or the immanent phenomenon which prevents it from falling and dissolving into philosophy and the sciences*, from being dogmatically reduced to philosophy, indeed to a techno-philosophical mixture like, for example, "conceptual" or "desiring machines," or reduced to the applications of supposedly "fundamental" sciences. A science of the essence of technics is the best means of keeping the latter from its double ontological and scientific reduction. The philosophies of technics are blind to the fact that they do not recognize the problem of identity or essence as such, i.e. of the *reality* of technics, and that it is the object of a special science which re-establishes the correct and "full" formulation: "a *science of the essence* (of) technics," performing the real critique of the philosophical repression of this essence. It is thus a question of placing a term in the discourses of the techno-logical foundation of technics, of pronouncing their theoretical impossibility, without denying their usage of data within the interior of a science for all that.

### The Hypothesis of First Technology

How should we characterize this special science from the perspective of its theoretical meaning which is adapted to essences and makes use of certain philosophical formations, for example onto-techno-logy which is oriented like meta-technical discourses and their regional properties attempting to understand the Essence (of) technics? Here are its grand traits.

1. A body of phenomena or properties is given: thus no longer pretended properties in themselves of supposedly technical objects, but techno-logical discourses themselves. Not the phenomena with which Simondon would be concerned, for example, and which we would claim to re-interpret, but better yet the descriptions which he gives and which are, as such, *our* "objects." But there is an important specification: that we treat the techno-logical discourses as meta-technical discourses which are concerned with the Essence (of) technics but via an illusory mode and due to a repression. All onto-techno-logy (Heidegger included since he does not invalidate it from the outset) can be treated like a vast program for the philosophical foundation of technics, as a meta-technics. And, under this form, this is what constitutes our region of phenomena. It is obviously a question of explaining and limiting in a science these foundational programs which are the philosophies of technics.

2. A space is given, a scientific but transcendental posture instead of an interiority (which adds nothing to the concept of science) in which these meta-technical discourses come to be projected. A posture, i.e. here the minimal conditions through which a science was possible, a *reality* of the latter. *Therefore, why does it have to be of science rather than simply of philosophy?* This problem is extremely limited. It does not eliminate the question of the empirical conditions of whichever science—a condition of objects for example (since science exerts us to bring the region of technological phenomena into play)—but the philosophical or epistemological reduction of the essence of science to its empirical conditions, for example to its methods or procedures, to its work, etc. and its reduction to its ontological conditions. What is the *reality* of science rather than its effectivity and its conditions of possibility? So that there was able to be a reality and thus an autonomous essence of science rather than a simple possibility of the latter, it is therefore necessary that there was Being, in the sense that the tradition and Heidegger can still understand as

presence or representation, as ontological project, but it is necessary, if this does not suffice, that there was the One first of all—not just any One [non pas de l'Un], but “the One itself” and therefore a non-metaphysical but purely transcendental usage of science. And then the Multiple is necessary, i.e. still Being, if you will, but in a new, precisely non-philosophical sense, although not absolutely foreign to this philosophical sense.

“The One itself:” no longer that which philosophy places in the neighborhood of Being and concerning which it supposes a convertibility with the latter; no longer the arithmetico-philosophical mixture of the number 1 interiorized and supported in the metaphysical One; but that which has already been called “radical immanence,” deprived of scission, nothingness, transcendence and alienation. We will call it the One-of-the-last-instance so as to mark its inalienable and nevertheless determining nature—this apparent contradiction being the content of the concept of “determination-in-the-last-instance”—determining the essences (of) science and (of) technics. This One is above all neither science nor technics, i.e. their essence, it is only the immanent cause of these essences.

But such a cause, being given its purely transcendental yet real and no longer *also* metaphysical or ontological status, is no longer a posited and metaphysical entity, autopoised in a philosophical discourse. Its theoretical status is that of a *hypothesis* or an *axiom* (neither logical-formal, nor logical-real—Self=Self—but purely real or immanent in-the-last-instance). *First technology* is thus not an *a priori* or speculative construction—despite certain appearances—it is also a science proceeding by hypothesis, but now in a transcendental or real in-the-last-instance usage of the latter.

As for the “Multiple” which is the content of Being, i.e. no longer arising from the cause but from the element of representation or from scientific “presentation” properly speaking, it is deduced from the One under certain conditions which we will pass over here (those of a science of the Essence (of) science using philosophy as material). From this perspective, Being has three or four characteristics:

- a) it is devoid as void (of the) One, ir-real as devoid (of) the real, (non-One); and obviously also and by definition devoid of every philosophical form, of every philosophical and/or technological consistency;
- b) this void is identically a pure Multiple, unrepresentable as the One itself is unrepresentable; thus deprived of every philosophical form of closure or unity, but also of every form of consistency of the regional scientific type, for example arithmetic and the arithmetico-philosophical mixed form;
- c) however this Multiple receives a consistency of the One itself, but consistency-of-the-last-instance and nevertheless absolutely internal; it is neither ontic (arithmetic) nor ontological (“presence”);
- d) this Multiple is completely determined when it is specified in accordance with philosophy and its structures or properties—we do not describe this specification here.

These are the minimal conditions that explain the non-philosophical *reality* of science, or which gives this to it (knowledge if it is real *by itself* is not our problem). Not the sufficient reason of science, but the cause which can determine it in-the-last-instance, i.e. *by using science without modifying it as such. This is a paradigm of intelligibility which is neither philosophical nor scientific or positivist; it is founded on a new type of non-epistemological intersection between philosophy and science where the latter acquires the means of treating the former as its object without reducing it in a positivist way for all that.*

3. It now suffices to be given this scientific posture and to project or reduce the technological discourses so as to be able to elaborate a rigorous, non-illusory discourse on the Essence (of) technics. Whereas the philosophies of technics delve full speed ahead into metatechnics, into techno-logical exaggeration, we inhibit this process, we invert it in some way, instituting a discipline of scientific essence which has for its phenomena the meta-sciences or here meta-technics, and for its real object, to be determined rigorously in reality, via a non-philosophical mode, essences and only essences.

It is not “technoscience” which is a problem, but *techno-philosophy*, of which “technoscience” is an avatar and an artifact.

We then call *Essence (of) technics* the ensemble of residues abandoned by techno-logical or meta-technical statements and which permits still being called knowledge, when it is posed as a hypothesis of an explicative nature, i.e. theoretical and critical, this scientific posture itself, at least its real essential ingredients. The Essence (of) technics is thus known and on the other hand has explicated the illusory forms under which this essence is given in technological discourses. What we call the scientific posture corresponds to the Essence (of) science such as we can grasp it without interpreting it epistemologically, and it functions here as a hypothesis no longer of the philosophical type and relative to what must be interpreted, but of the scientific type, heterogeneous to phenomena and only capable of giving rise to a true explication instead of a more or less circular interpretation.

The onto-techno-logical schema is a *given* in opposition to the truly first given which is the One. And it is only when it is treated as material that it appears afterward as a double which would not so much take the place of essence itself but the elaboration of its knowledge. Science does not *return* from the imaginary double to the real veiled by it; it does not dissipate the double, it has access to it so as to know the real and give it its status as double; and the double is that which techno-logic becomes when, prohibited from being a point of view, it is treated as simple material.

This position of the problem has important consequences on the status of techno-logy. We make use of the techno-logical schema as a simple index and material. A science does not trace its real object from its phenomena which are only a partially external and repressive construction of the Essence (of) technics.

Saving the immanent phenomenon from the technics of its philosophical survey and its objectification is the primary goal. It is thus not at all a question of founding a new technics more powerful still, a new type of “instrument” or better yet a new (philosophical and “mythological”) conception of technics *over* the foundation of a science or through the conversion and techno-logical investment of the latter, but of procuring a rigorous, non-interpretive knowledge of technics for ourselves. And it is the knowledge which is new, not “technics.” What we call “first technology” is thus no longer an effective technology—here it is not in our power to invent it—or a philosophical generality or a “concept” of technics; it is the knowledge, *de facto* primary or anterior to every philosophy, of its essence—of an essence which leaves it in its state without claiming to appropriate it.

Original translation by Taylor Adkins 8/03/08.

taken from here

← PREVIOUS   NEXT →

---

## META

CONTACT

FORCE-INC/MILLE PLATEAUX

IMPRESSUM

DATENSCHUTZERKLÄRUNG

## TAXONOMY

CATEGORIES

TAGS

AUTHORS

ALL INPUT

## SOCIAL

FACEBOOK

INSTAGRAM

TWITTER